

2021 September Moderation - Report



Meeting Details

Which meeting is this report for?

Health Studies Level 3

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 1

Sample 1 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 2 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 1 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C2 = t+ C7 = C-

Sample 1 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

C2 t+

A group was identified.

Some health concerns were presented.

The response was short.

While all parts of the question were answered, there was a lack of detail and explanation.

Some of the included data was not correct.

C7 C-

There was some structure to the response.

Some relevant terminology was used, but not overly complex or specialised.

There were no paragraphs.

Spelling and punctuation were generally fine, but there were some grammatical issues.

Sample 1 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

C2

Given that the question required students to 'describe' two factors and 'detail' once action, discussion of factors and the action needed to be more comprehensive and detailed. For example, when describing the factors, information on how the factor, if addressed, would improve health status. It is not enough to just say education would reduce smoking - some details of how/why/what would also be needed to meet the

'description' aspect of the question.

All data needed to be correct.

The answer needed to contain more extensive evidence to reflect the 30 minutes that was available to spend on it.

C7

The answer needed to be broken up into paragraphs.

More specialised terminology needed to be included throughout the response.

More care to ensure expression/language is clear and ideas are described logically.

Sample 1 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Emphasise the importance of students allocating the appropriate time to each question to ensure that they have enough time to produce an answer that reflects the allocated time.

Teachers did raise concerns about C7 ratings possibly being adversely affected by short responses - due to a lack of complexity, a lack of specialised terms, a lack of paragraphs (this links to the first point above about making sure students allocate appropriate time to each question).

Encourage students to highlight key words in the questions that indicate what is required for each part - for example, what does outline, describe, detail, explain mean, and what is required when a question (or part of a question includes these terms).

Reviewing the differences between the phrases: health concerns, health conditions, health issues to help ensure students interpret questions correctly.

Moderation Details for Calibration - Sample 2

Sample 2 - Please identify each criterion being moderated and IF SELECTED the elements within that criterion

Criterion 2 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2

Criterion 7 = Overall, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Sample 2 - What rating (or ratings) has the group assigned this sample?

C2 = C+ C7 = B

Sample 2 - What evidence supports the rating (or ratings) the group has given?

C2 = C+

The answer included some relevant data.

Health concerns included a lack of health services, a health condition, and issues with diet, which highlighted the question around what is classified as a health 'concern', but they were all considered acceptable choices.

Issues with repetition of ideas in concerns and factors section (which again highlighted the issue with the wording concern).

The discussion of factors was quite weak and confusing.

Evidence of knowledge but ideas not described in enough depth.

Section on Royal Flying Doctor Service was better part of answer - relevant information included, but still potential to for a little more.

Issues with inconsistent approach to groups - remote, then outside of cities, then rural. Remote is a very small portion of the people who are outside major cities, so clarity around defining the group that the discussion was focused on was needed.

C7 = B

Paragraphs were used.

Some spelling and punctuation issues (minor).

Some language/expression issues.

Some terminology included, but more specialised terminology was needed.

Repetition of ideas affected the clear, accurate, logical, coherent presentation of ideas.

Inconsistent use of 'group category' - remote, rural, outside of city.

Sample 2 - What evidence would you need to see in order to assign a higher rating (or ratings)?

C2

Reconsider choices of 'health concerns' and 'factors' so that repetition of ideas was not an issue.

In explanation of factors, provide more details to show how the factor would improve the health status. For example, if discussing how more health services would improve detection, students could include an example of a health issue that would benefit from early detection (like skin cancer).

Improve the clarity of descriptions and add specific details to assist this.

A few extra details about the RFDS would have also helped provide evidence required to achieve a higher rating.

Sample 2 - What actions would you recommend for teachers to help the student attain a higher rating (or ratings)?

Remind students of same advice as above (although some points less relevant because this response was longer).

Encourage students to devote some time (during tests and exams) to planning their response - this will help with reducing the chances of repetition of ideas and also assist students in presenting a clear, logical and coherent response - particularly for the 30 minute responses.

Planning for March Moderation 2022 - Statewide Samples

For all courses please nominate the criteria and elements (if desired) for moderation.

Criteria 3 - Global Health short answer questions

State the name of the person who will be providing the samples for moderation

Michelle Rybka and Melinda Minstrell

Other comments

Some teachers who were markers commented that they were told that they were marking too hard, but after the discussion at moderation, felt that teachers were marking harder than what they had been during exam marking. Best practice is for teachers/markers to exclude context factors (mode, internal, external, time, support, etc.) and focus on rating evidence against the standards.

The discussion that exam markers have before they begin to mark is helpful in establishing boundaries and sharing collective expectations for consistency in approaches.

Moderation marking is quite different because each teacher is likely marking the work in isolation based on what they would have expected from their own students.

Despite this, the discussion of samples 1 and 2 did end with a consensus that did not vary much (+ or - either way).

Issues with unpacking elements that are being assessed may not emerge until the discussion at moderation – some of these could be flagged and included in moderation notes/answer guides/question documentation that comes through via Canvas.

It was agreed that only three samples should be viewed in future as five extended answers was challenging. This occurred due to time pressure in getting samples, and communication with Darren/Michelle.

Some teachers raised concerns over the three meetings in one day, which can be a massive load for teachers involved in all three sessions, or if juggling teaching other classes during the day.

Given the issues we had and the personal feelings of the participants, face-to-face meetings are preferred by many - the online environment limits and impedes the quality of discussions that occurred during face-to-face meetings. Teachers would be happy with regional meetings face-to-face, as the notes are shared across the state.

Discussion of rating versus marks - at end-of-year, responses are given a mark out of 30 (so that it can be combined with 10 marks from short questions.) Single use marking tools are task specific and used to guide the rating of evidence against the standards.

Assuming that the 30-minute response in the end of year exam is meant to be an extended response, should the question set by the examiner make explicit mention of this? For example:

Question 9

There is significant variation in the health status of different population groups in Australia.

Using your knowledge of one such group, write an extended response that:

- outlines three significant health concerns for the group.
- describes two factors that, if addressed, may result in an improved health status across

this population group.

- details one action that has been designed to address the inequalities in health for this group.

(30 marks)

Sharing Resources

Please record any links to or details of resources that were shared, or describe any assessment strategies that were discussed.

Reminder web resources on Teams (SD - HPE) -> Health (Channel) -> Health Studies (folder)

Numerous teachers expressed concern about being unable to access the Teams resources (non-government schools).
<https://1and12.education.tas.gov.au/communities-of-practice/> has instructions that should help – alternatively email years9to12learning@education.tas.gov.au for assistance.

Teachers expressed a desire to share resources, and therefore a group email approach is being established through the moderation leaders (who will also place copies of the resources shared within Teams for others).

Course Support

Please provide details of any future focus and ways forward you would like Years 9 to 12 Learning to consider in relation to this course:

Numerous teachers expressed concern about being unable to access the Teams resources (non-government schools). There are no known issues - advice from local ICT support and advice provided in links above should address this.

The discussion that exam markers have before they begin to mark is helpful in clarifying expected task specific evidences and establishing boundaries. Moderation marking can be more challenging with teachers working in isolation and marking the work based on their interpretation of the task, standards and typical evidence they would expect from their students.

Issues with assessing elements at moderation - some clarification on how they are used would help moderation and provided support documentation that comes through via Canvas. However, the elements are not stipulated on the exams.

It was agreed that only three samples should be viewed.

Some teachers raised concerns over the three meetings in one day, which can be a massive load for teachers involved in all three sessions, or if juggling teaching other classes during the day.

Given the issues we had and the personal feelings of the participants, face-to-face meetings are preferred by many - the online environment limits and impedes the quality discussions that occurred during face-to face meetings. Teachers would be happy with regional meetings face-to-face, as the notes are shared across the state.